

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

IN RE: SANTA FE NATURAL TOBACCO  
COMPANY MARKETING & SALES  
PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY  
LITIGATION

LEAD CASE NO. MD 16-2695 JB/LF

This Document Relates to All Cases

*Lytle, et al. v. Nutramax Laboratories, Inc., et al.*, Case No. ED CV 19-0835 FMO

(“*Nutramax*”) (Olguin, F.) (Ex. 1), is another example of a court granting class certification of a class of consumer product purchasers where Dr. Jean Pierre Dubé proffered the precise damages methodology offered in support of class certification here. Furthermore, the *Nutramax* court denied the defendants’ *Daubert* challenge as to Dr. Dubé.

In *Nutramax*, the plaintiffs challenged the advertising on the packaging as misleading to the reasonable consumer and alleged that the plaintiffs either would not have bought the products or were charged a price premium as a result of the defendants’ packaging misrepresentations. *Id.* at 2.

The court considered the defendants’ arguments that 1) Dr. Dubé did not utilize critical data in his damages analysis, 2) he did not execute the conjoint analysis, and 3) the class members were not all exposed to the challenged statements. *Id.* at 10. The court concluded that conjoint analysis is a well-established method for measuring class-wide damages in consumer protection actions and satisfies *Comcast Corp. v. Behrend*, 569 U.S. 27 (2013). *Id.* at 31. Further, the court confirmed Dr. Dubé need not actually execute on the conjoint analysis at class certification so long as his model is capable of measuring damages on a class-wide basis, which is all that *Comcast* requires. *Id.* Rejecting the defendants’ argument that the class includes

individuals who did not see the challenged claims, the court concluded that where at least one of the challenged claims can be found on the front packaging of the products (with other claims prominently elsewhere), a conjoint analysis is a sufficient tool to measure the impact of challenged label claims. *Id.* The court was likewise unpersuaded that the alleged inclusion of uninjured class members (individuals who had expressed satisfaction with the products) defeats the plaintiffs' ability to measure damages on a class-wide basis. *Id.* at 32.

Here, Dr. Dubé concluded that the determination of class-wide economic damages can be calculated using a conjoint analysis. ECF No. 280-008. Using the preference estimates from the Conjoint Analysis, Dr. Dube opines he can implement a marketplace simulation to measure the price premium. *Id.* ¶19. Further, the preference estimates from the Conjoint Analysis can likewise be used to measure willingness-to-pay, the microeconomic measure of total incremental class-wide economic value from the benefits associated with the Challenged Claims on the labels of the Challenged Products. *Id.* ¶20. The *Nutramax*, like many courts nationwide, found this exact damages methodologies feasible and capable of calculating class-wide damages.

*Nutramax*, Ex. 1 at 33.

In granting class certification, Judge Olguin's reasoned opinion considered the latest attacks on the utilization of conjoint analysis for calculating class-wide damages and concluded Dr. Dubé's methodology is sound.

June 1, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

By /s/ Melissa S. Weiner

Melissa S. Weiner

PEARSON, SIMON & WARSHAW, LLP

800 LaSalle Ave., Suite 2150

Minneapolis, MN 55402

Phone: (612) 389-0601

Email: mweiner@pswlaw.com

Scott P. Schlesinger  
Jeffrey L. Haberman  
Jonathan R. Gdanski  
SCHLESINGER LAW OFFICES, P.A.  
1212 SE Third Ave.  
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33316  
Phone: (954) 467-8800  
Email: [scott@schlesingerlaw.com](mailto:scott@schlesingerlaw.com)  
Email: [jhaberman@schlesingerlaw.com](mailto:jhaberman@schlesingerlaw.com)  
Email: [jgdanski@schlesingerlaw.com](mailto:jgdanski@schlesingerlaw.com)

D. Greg Blankinship  
FINKELSTEIN, BLANKINSHIP, FREI-  
PEARSON & GARBER, LLP  
One North Broadway, Suite 900  
White Plains, NY 10601  
(914) 298-3290  
Email: [gblankinship@fbfglaw.com](mailto:gblankinship@fbfglaw.com)

Caleb Marker  
ZIMMERMAN REED LLP  
2381 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 328  
Manhattan Beach, CA 90245  
(877) 500-8780 Telephone  
(877) 500-8781 Facsimile  
Email: [caleb.marker@zimmreed.com](mailto:caleb.marker@zimmreed.com)

Michael R. Reese  
REESE LLP  
100 West 93rd Street, 16th Floor  
New York, New York 10025  
Telephone: (212) 643-0500  
Facsimile: (212) 253-4272  
Email: [mreese@reesellp.com](mailto:mreese@reesellp.com)

James W. Gustafson, Jr.  
SEARCY DENNEY SCAROLA BARNHART &  
SHIPLEY, P.A.  
The Towle House, 517 North Calhoun Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32301  
Telephone: (850) 224-7600  
Email: [gustafsonteam@searcylaw.com](mailto:gustafsonteam@searcylaw.com)

Matthew D. Shultz  
LEVIN, PAPANTONIO, ET AL.  
316 S. Baylen St., Suite 600  
Pensacola, FL 32502  
Phone: (850) 435-7140  
Email: [mschultz@levinlaw.com](mailto:mschultz@levinlaw.com)

Ronald A. Marron  
LAW OFFICES OF RONALD A. MARRON  
651 Arroyo Drive  
San Diego, California 92103  
Telephone: (619) 696-9006  
Facsimile: (619) 564-6665  
Email: ron@consumersadvocates.com

***Counsel for Plaintiffs and Proposed Class  
Counsel***